



F bruary 1, 2002

A THERMADYNE. Company

David Small PO Box 128 Sharon VT 05065 Kevin Homer-Richardson Torch Engineering Manager Thermal Dynamics Corporation Industrial Park #2 West Lebanon, NH 03784

603 298-6268 FAX: 603 298-6461

Subject: Declaration and Power of Attorney for Patent Application (Ref TDTD10465.1)

Dear David,

Enclosed you will find a complete copy of a patent application (ref. No. TDTD10465.1) that was made to the US Patent and Trademark Office for an invention in which you are named as an inventor. Also enclosed are the Declaration and Power of Attorney for your signature as inventor.

Please review the application and, if everything is satisfactory, sign the Declaration and Power of Attorney where indicated. I need your signed documents returned to me by February 19, 2002. If I do not receive the signed documents from you by February 19, 2002, I will assume that you are refusing to sign them and will proceed with the application according to that assumption.

You can mail signed documents to me at:

Kevin Honrer-Richardson Thermal Dynamics 82 Benning St. West Lebanon NH 03784

Please feel free to call me if you have any questions or comments.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Kevin Horner-Richardson Torch Engineering Manager

Encl.

Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.

Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.

Attach this card to the back of the mailplace, or on the front if space parmits.

1. Article Addressed for SHARON

P.O. Bex 128 FEB 0 9 2002

3. Service Type

Certified Mass.

PS Form 3811, July 1999

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

-	
	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY
	A. Received by Please Print Clearly) B. Date of Delivery 2 - 9 - 2
	C. Signature X Appril Addressee
	D. Is delivery address different from item 1? Yes If YES, enter delivery address below: No
Y	600.000
l	
1	3. Service Type Certified Mail. Express Maj Registered. Return Receipt for Merchandise
	Insured Mail C.O.D. 4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)
	The Head Control (State 1999)

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

First-Class Mall Postage & Fees Paid USPS Permit No. G-10

Sender: Please print your name, address, and ZIP+4 in this box

KEVIN HORNOR-RICUANDSON
THERMAL DYNAMICS CORP.
INDUSTRIAL PARK # 2
WEST LEBANON NH 03784

Manuffdallahalahalallahallanallahali





COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

Paper No. 6

COPY MAILED

SENNIGER POWERS LEAVITT AND ROEDEL ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE 16TH FLOOR **ST LOUIS, MO 63102**

In re Application of Horner-Richardson et al. Application No. 09/821,868 Filed: March 30, 2001 Attorney Docket No. TDTD 10465.1 DECISION REFUSING SOATUS OF THE UNDER 37 CFR 1.47(a)

This is in response to the petition, filed October 10, 2001, under 37 C.F.R. §1.47(a).

The petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.47(a) is **DISMISSED**.

Rule 47 applicant is given TWO MONTHS from the mailing date of this decision to reply, correcting the below-noted deficiencies. Any reply should be entitled "Request for Reconsideration of Petition Under 37 C.F.R. §1.47(a)," and should only address the deficiencies noted below, except that the reply may include an oath or declaration executed by the non-signing inventor. Failure to respond will result in abandonment of the application. Any extensions of time will be governed by 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a).

The above-identified application was filed on March 30, 2001, without an executed oath or declaration. Accordingly, on May 11, 2001, applicant was mailed a "Notice to File Missing Parts of Nonprovisional Application - Filing Date Granted," requiring an executed oath or declaration in compliance with §1.63, and a surcharge for its late filing. This Notice set a two-month period for reply of July 11, 2001.

In reply, applicant filed a petition, petition fee and the surcharge for late filing of the declaration. To make timely the reply, a three month extension of time was also submitted. In support of the petition, applicants submitted the affidavit of Kevin D. Horner- Richardson, co-inventor, a copy of the assignment documents, correspondence to the non-signing inventor and a oath or declaration.

A grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.47(a) requires: (1) proof that the non-signing inventor cannot be reached or refuses to sign the oath or declaration after having been presented with the application papers (specification, claims and drawings); (2) an acceptable oath or declaration in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §§115 and 116; (3) the petition fee; and (4) a statement of the last known address of the non-signing inventor. The instant petition does not satisfy requirements (1).

As to item (1), Rule 47 applicant has failed to show that the non-signing inventor refused to sign the declaration after having been presented with the application papers. The certified letter mailed to the non-signing inventor Small only indicates the

declaration and assignment documents were presented to the non-signing inventor. Before a refusal can be alleged, applicant must demonstrate a bona fide attempt was made to present a copy of application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) to the non-signing inventor. See MPEP 409.03(d). The e-mail correspondence between declarant and non-signing inventor alone is not sufficient to establish "diligent effort".

Thus on renewed petition, applicant must establish the **entire** application package (including specification, claims and drawings) was presented to the non-signing inventor and he refused to sign.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:

Commissioner for Patents

Box DAC

Washington, D.C. 20231

By FAX:

(703) 308-6916

Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand:

Crystal Plaza Four, Suite 3C23

2201 S. Clark Place

Arlington, VA

Telephone inquiries related to this decision may be directed to Petitions Attorney Charlema R. Grant at (703) 306-0251.

Beverly M. Flanagan

Buly Il Jo

Supervisory Petitions Examiner

Office of Petitions

Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy